Simple structure estimation via prenet penalization

Kei Hirose

Institute of Mathematics for Industry, Kyushu University,
744 Motooka, Nishi-ku, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan

E-mail: hirose@imi.kyushu-u.ac.jp.

arXiv:1607.01145v1 [stat.ME] 5 Jul 2016

Abstract

We propose a *prenet* (*p*roduct *e*lastic *net*), which is a new penalization method for factor analysis models. The penalty is based on the product of a pair of elements in each row of the loading matrix. The prenet not only shrinks some of the factor loadings toward exactly zero, but also enhances the simplicity of the loading matrix, which plays an important role in the interpretation of the estimated factors. In particular, with a large amount of prenet penalization, the estimated loading matrix possesses a perfect simple structure, which is known as a desirable structure in terms of the simplicity of the loading matrix. Furthermore, the perfect simple structure estimation via the prenet turns out to be a generalization of the k-means variables clustering. On the other hand, a mild amount of the penalization approximates a loading matrix estimated by the quartimin method, one of the most commonly used oblique rotation techniques. Thus, the proposed penalty bridges the gap between the perfect simple structure and the quartimin rotation. Monte Carlo simulation is conducted to investigate the performance of the proposed procedure. A real data analysis is also conducted to illustrate the usefulness of our penalty.

Key Words: Quartimin rotation, Penalized likelihood factor analysis, Perfect simple structure, Sparse estimation

1 Introduction

Factor analysis investigates the correlation structure of high-dimensional observed variables by construction of a small number of unobserved variables called common factors. Factor analysis can be considered as fuzzy variables clustering, in which observed variables are divided into overlapping clusters (common factors). An important point in the factor analysis is to estimate a well-clustered loading matrix, that is, each factor represents a meaningful relationship with the observed variables (Yamamoto and Jennrich 2013). In particular, each factor has a clear meaning if the loading matrix has the perfect

simple structure, wherein each row has at most one nonzero element (e.g., Bernaards and Jennrich 2003; Jennrich 2004). The perfect simple structure estimation corresponds to non-overlapping variables clustering; variables that correspond to nonzero elements of the jth column of the loading matrix belong to the jth cluster.

Conventionally, the well-clustered structure of the loading matrix is found by rotation techniques, such as the varimax method (Kaiser 1958) and the promax method (Hendrickson and White 1964). The problem with the rotation technique is that it cannot produce a sufficiently sparse solution in some cases (Hirose and Yamamoto 2015), because the loading matrix must be found within the unpenalized maximum likelihood estimates or unpenalized (generalized) least squares estimates. On the other hand, adding an L_1-type penalty on factor loadings, such as the lasso (Tibshirani 1996), to the objective function, has recently attracted attention. A significant feature of the penalization method is that it is a generalization of the rotation techniques, and can produce sparser solutions than the rotation methods (Hirose and Yamamoto 2015). Ning and Georgiou (2011) and Choi et al. (2011) applied the lasso-type penalized maximum likelihood procedure to obtain sparse factor loadings, and showed that the penalization method often outperforms the rotation methods numerically. Several researchers adopted the nonconvex penalties that enhance the sparsity of the lasso (e.g., Srivastava et al. 2014; Hirose and Yamamoto 2015). Adachi and Trendafilov (2015) introduced a general approach for both penalized likelihood estimation and penalized least squares estimation.

However, the lasso-type penalization procedure introduces two fundamental issues. First, the sparse estimation that makes some of the coefficients exactly zero is not guaranteed to produce a well-clustered structure of the loading matrix. For example, when we impose a great amount of lasso penalization, the estimated loading matrix becomes a zero matrix, which implies there are no cluster structures. The second issue is that the L_1 penalization often cannot approximate a true loading matrix when it is not sufficiently sparse; with the lasso, some of the factor loadings whose true values are close—but not very close—to zero are estimated as zero values, and this misspecification can often cause a significant negative effect on the estimation of other factor loadings (Hirose and Yamamoto 2014).

To handle the above issues, we propose a *prenet* (*pr*oduct *e*lastic *net*) penalty, which is based on the product of a pair of parameters in each row of the loading matrix. A remarkable feature of the prenet is that a large amount of penalization leads to the perfect simple structure, which is completely well-clustered. The existing penalization methods, including the lasso, elastic net (Zou and Hastie 2005), smoothly clipped absolute deviation

(SCAD; Fan and Li 2001), and many others that have been proposed, do not have that significant property. Furthermore, the perfect simple structure estimation via the prenet penalty is shown to be a generalization of the k-means variables clustering. On the other hand, with a mild amount of prenet penalization, the estimated loading matrix is approximated by that obtained using the quartimin rotation, a widely used oblique rotation method. The quartimin criterion can often estimate a non-sparse loading matrix appropriately, so that the second problem of the lasso-type penalization, as mentioned above, is addressed. To estimate the prenet solutions, we provide a simple algorithm, based on the generalized expectation and maximization (GEM) algorithm, and the coordinate descent algorithm (e.g., Friedman et al. 2010). The proposed algorithm monotonically decreases the objective function at each step. The performance of the prenet is investigated through the Monte Carlo simulation. We apply the proposed method to handwritten digit data, and obtain an interesting habit of writing digit "0." The proposed procedure is available for use in the `R` package `fanc`*.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the estimation of the factor analysis model via penalization. In Section 3, we introduce the prenet penalty and provide an illustrative example. Section 4 describes several properties of the prenet penalty, including its relationship with the quartimin criterion. Section 5 presents an estimation algorithm, which is based on the GEM and coordinate descent algorithms, to obtain the prenet solutions. In Section 6, we present a numerical study using both artificial and real datasets. Section 7 discusses the results and concludes.

2 Estimation of the factor model via the penalization method

Let $\boldsymbol{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_p)^T$ be a p-dimensional observed random vector with mean vector $\mathbf{0}$ and variance–covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. The factor analysis model is

$$\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{F} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = (\lambda_{ij})$ is a $p \times m$ loading matrix, and $\boldsymbol{F} = (F_1, \cdots, F_m)^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_p)^T$ are unobservable random vectors. The elements of $\boldsymbol{F}$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ are called common factors and unique factors, respectively. It is assumed that $E(\boldsymbol{F}) = \mathbf{0}$, $E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \mathbf{0}$, $E(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{F}^T) = \boldsymbol{I}_m$, $E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T) = \boldsymbol{\Psi}$, and $E(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T) = \boldsymbol{O}$, where $\boldsymbol{I}_m$ is an identity matrix of order m, and $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ is a $p \times p$ diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are referred to as unique variances, ψ_i.

*Available at `http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/fanc`

Under these assumptions, the variance–covariance matrix of observed random vector $\boldsymbol{X}$ is given by $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T + \boldsymbol{\Psi}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{x}_N$ be N observations and $\boldsymbol{S} = (s_{ij})$ be the corresponding sample covariance matrix. We estimate the model parameter by minimizing the penalized loss function $\ell_\rho(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\Psi})$ given by

$$\ell_\rho(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}) = \ell(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}) + \rho P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}), \tag{1}$$

where $\ell(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\Psi})$ is a loss function, $P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})$ is a penalty function, and $\rho > 0$ is a tuning parameter. Two popular loss functions are given as follows.

Quadratic loss A general form of the quadratic loss is given by

$$\ell_{\mathrm{QL}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}) = \|\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{S} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T - \boldsymbol{\Psi})\|^2,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ is an arbitrary matrix. When $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = \boldsymbol{I}$, $\ell_{\mathrm{QL}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\Psi})$ becomes a square loss function. $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = \boldsymbol{S}^{-1}$ results in the generalized square loss function.

Discrepancy function Another popular loss function is the discrepancy function

$$\ell_{\mathrm{ML}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}) = \frac{1}{2}\left\{\mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{S}) - \log|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{S}| - p\right\}. \tag{2}$$

Assume that the observations $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{x}_N$ are drawn from the p-dimensional normal population $N_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ with $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T + \boldsymbol{\Psi}$. The minimizer of $\ell_{\mathrm{ML}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\Psi})$ is the maximum likelihood estimate. Note that $\ell_{\mathrm{ML}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}) \leq 0$ for any $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$, and $\ell_{\mathrm{ML}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}) = 0$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T + \boldsymbol{\Psi} = \boldsymbol{S}$.

Hereafter we use a discrepancy function as a loss function but our proposed penalty, described in Section 3, can be directly applied to many other loss functions.

The factor analysis model has a rotational indeterminacy; both $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\mathbf{T}$ generate the same covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, where $\boldsymbol{T}$ is an arbitrary orthogonal matrix. Thus, when $\rho = 0$, the solution that minimizes (1) is not uniquely determined. However, when $\rho > 0$, the solution may be uniquely determined when an appropriate penalty $P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})$ is chosen. An example is the lasso penalty (Tibshirani 1996), given by $P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p}\sum_{j=1}^{m}|\lambda_{ij}|$. The lasso-type penalization produces a sparse solution, that is, some of the estimates of factor loadings become exactly zero.

Remark 2.1. There are several latent variable models related to the standard factor model. Here, we describe three models.

1. We can assume a factor correlation (i.e., $E[\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{F}^T] = \boldsymbol{\Phi}$) and estimate it by the penalized maximum likelihood method (Hirose and Yamamoto 2014).

2. The approximate factor model (e.g., Stock and Watson 2002), in which $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ does not have to be a diagonal matrix, may be more flexible than the standard factor model.

3. $\boldsymbol{\Psi} = \sigma^2 \boldsymbol{I}$ corresponds to the probabilistic principal component analysis (Tipping and Bishop 1999). This fact implies that the factor analysis is viewed as a generalization of principal component analysis.

Our proposed penalty, presented in Section 3, can be directly applied to a wide variety of latent variable models, including the above three models.

3 Prenet penalty

We propose the *prenet* (*pr*oduct *e*lastic *net*) penalty

$$P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \sum_{k>j} \left\{ \gamma |\lambda_{ij}||\lambda_{ik}| + \frac{1}{2}(1-\gamma)\lambda_{ij}^2 \lambda_{ik}^2 \right\}, \tag{3}$$

where $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ is a tuning parameter. The most significant feature of the prenet penalty is that it is based on the *product* of a pair of parameters.

The penalty $P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})$ is referred to as separable if it is written as $P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \sum_{j=1}^{m} P(|\lambda_{ij}|)$. It is shown that the prenet penalty is not separable. Many existing penalties, including the lasso, elastic net, and SCAD penalties, are separable. The most popular nonseparable penalty would be the fused lasso (Tibshirani et al. 2005), in which the penalty is based on the *difference* of the coefficients.

When $\gamma = 0$, the prenet penalty is equivalent to the quartimin criterion (Carroll 1953), a widely used oblique rotation criterion in factor rotation. As is the case with the quartimin rotation, the prenet penalty in (3) eliminates the rotational indeterminacy and contributes significantly to the estimation of the simplicity of the loading matrix. When $\gamma > 0$, the prenet penalty includes products of absolute values of factor loadings, producing factor loadings that are *exactly* zero. Therefore, with an appropriate value of γ, the prenet penalty enhances both the simplicity and the sparsity of the loading matrix.

3.1 Comparison with the elastic net penalty

The prenet penalty is similar to the elastic net penalty (Zou and Hastie 2005)

$$P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left\{ \gamma |\lambda_{ij}| + \frac{1}{2}(1-\gamma)\lambda_{ij}^2 \right\}, \tag{4}$$



Figure 1: Penalty functions of the prenet (left-hand side) and the elastic net (right-hand side) with $\gamma = 0.7$.

which is a hybrid of the lasso penalty (first term) and the ridge penalty (second term). Although the prenet penalty and the elastic net penalty are similar, there is a fundamental difference between these two penalties; the elastic net is based on the sum of the functions of components, but the prenet is based on the product of a pair of parameters.

Figure 2 shows the penalty functions of the prenet ($P(x, y) = \gamma|x||y| + (1-\gamma)x^2y^2/2$) and the elastic net ($P(x, y) = \gamma(|x| + |y|) + (1-\gamma)(x^2+y^2)/2$) when $\gamma = 0.7$. Clearly, the prenet penalty is a nonconvex function. A significant difference between the prenet and the elastic net is that although the prenet penalty becomes zero when *either* x or y attains zero, the elastic net penalty becomes zero only when *both* $x = 0$ and $y = 0$. Therefore, for a two-factor model, either λ_{i1} or λ_{i2} tends to be close to zero with the prenet penalty, which leads to a perfect simple structure. On the other hand, the elastic net tends to produce estimates in which both λ_{i1} and λ_{i2} are small.

With the prenet penalty, the second term of (3) allows the estimation of the simplicity of the loading matrix. However, the second term of the elastic net penalty in (4) (i.e., ridge penalty) does not contribute in any way to the estimation of the simplicity of the

loading matrix. In fact, the ridge penalty can be expressed as

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\lambda_{ij}^2 = \mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\boldsymbol{T}\boldsymbol{T}^T\boldsymbol{\Lambda})$$

for any orthogonal matrix $\boldsymbol{T}$, which implies the rotational indeterminacy cannot be eliminated with the ridge penalty. On the other hand, the lasso makes some of the coefficients move toward exactly zero, which may estimate an interpretable loading matrix. Nevertheless, the lasso works well only when the true loading matrix is sufficiently sparse. Otherwise, the lasso can estimate a loading matrix that is completely different from the true one (Hirose and Yamamoto 2014). We provide a simple numerical example in the next Subsection to illustrate this point.

3.2 Illustrative example

Assume that the true loading matrix is

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_d = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0.8 & 0.7 & 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.2 \\ 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.9 & 0.8 & 0.7 \end{pmatrix}^T. \tag{5}$$

Here, "d" in $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_d$ denotes density, because the loading matrix does not include zero values. We construct a covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_d\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_d^T + \boldsymbol{\Psi}$ with $\boldsymbol{\Psi} = \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_d\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_d^T)$, and then generate 50 samples from $N(\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$. In many simulation studies of the factor model (e.g., Lopes and West 2004), some of the true factor loadings are exactly zero, as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_s = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0.8 & 0.7 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\ 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.9 & 0.8 & 0.7 \end{pmatrix}^T. \tag{6}$$

Here, "s" in $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_s$ denotes sparsity. In this numerical example, we use $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_d$ instead of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_s$. This is because in many applications, some of the factor loadings can be nearly—but not exactly—zero.

With the penalization procedure, we expect that

(i) for large ρ, the estimated loading matrix is close to (6),

(ii) for small ρ, we obtain an estimate close to (5).

Table 1 shows the loading matrices estimated by the elastic net for various values of ρ. With the lasso penalty (i.e., $\gamma = 1$), when $\rho > 0.28$, we obtain a one-factor model: the largest value that provides a two-factor model with the lasso is $\rho = 0.28$. In this case, $\hat{\lambda}_{41}$, $\hat{\lambda}_{51}$, and $\hat{\lambda}_{61}$ are nonzero, which means (i) is not satisfied. When ρ is small, $\hat{\lambda}_{12}$, $\hat{\lambda}_{22}$,

Table 1: Loading matrices estimated by the lasso for various values of ρ.

	$\gamma = 1$						$\gamma = 0.01$					
	$\rho = 0.28$		$\rho = 0.1$		$\rho = 0.01$		$\rho = 1.0$		$\rho = 0.1$		$\rho = 0.01$	
	F1	F2	F1	F2	F1	F2	F1	F2	F1	F2	F1	F2
V1	0.63	0.00	0.74	0.00	0.85	0.00	0.52	-0.00	0.77	-0.00	0.86	0.01
V2	0.66	0.00	0.76	0.00	0.86	0.00	0.53	0.00	0.79	0.01	0.87	0.02
V3	0.46	0.00	0.59	0.04	0.70	0.08	0.39	0.06	0.62	0.08	0.70	0.10
V4	0.20	0.52	0.35	0.58	0.50	0.64	0.28	0.40	0.43	0.60	0.50	0.66
V5	0.09	0.60	0.24	0.68	0.38	0.74	0.21	0.43	0.32	0.69	0.38	0.75
V6	0.10	0.46	0.26	0.55	0.40	0.62	0.22	0.36	0.34	0.57	0.40	0.63

Table 2: Loading matrices estimated by the prenet for various values of ρ.

	$\gamma = 1$						$\gamma = 0.01$					
	$\rho = 0.4$		$\rho = 0.2$		$\rho = 0.01$		$\rho = 43$		$\rho = 0.5$		$\rho = 0.02$	
	F1	F2	F1	F2	F1	F2	F1	F2	F1	F2	F1	F2
V1	0.88	0.00	0.83	0.00	0.86	0.00	0.88	0.00	0.81	0.15	0.84	0.21
V2	0.87	0.00	0.85	0.00	0.88	0.00	0.87	0.00	0.82	0.16	0.85	0.22
V3	0.71	0.00	0.68	0.04	0.71	0.08	0.71	0.00	0.64	0.20	0.67	0.26
V4	0.00	0.83	0.32	0.64	0.51	0.65	0.00	0.83	0.26	0.72	0.34	0.76
V5	0.00	0.85	0.19	0.75	0.39	0.75	0.00	0.85	0.14	0.80	0.20	0.83
V6	0.00	0.76	0.22	0.62	0.40	0.63	0.00	0.76	0.18	0.68	0.25	0.71

and $\hat{\lambda}_{32}$ are still close to zero, but $\hat{\lambda}_{41}$, $\hat{\lambda}_{51}$, and $\hat{\lambda}_{61}$ become much larger than the true values. Estimating some coefficients toward *exactly* zero makes other small coefficients larger than expected. As a result, (ii) is not satisfied with the lasso. When $\gamma = 0.01$, we obtain similar results, and thus, the ridge penalty does not make any contribution to the approximation of the true loading matrix.

The loading matrices estimated by the prenet penalty are given in Table 2. $\gamma = 1$ implies the second term in (3), $\sum_{i,j,k} \lambda_{ij}^2 \lambda_{ik}^2$, is not included. When $\gamma = 1$, the prenet is able to produce a solution that is very close to (6) for large ρ. When ρ is small, however, we obtain a tendency similar to the lasso; $\hat{\lambda}_{41}$, $\hat{\lambda}_{51}$, and $\hat{\lambda}_{61}$ are larger than the true values. Therefore, (i) is satisfied but (ii) is not when $\gamma = 1$.

When $\gamma = 0.01$, the second term in (3), $\sum_{i,j,k} \lambda_{ij}^2 \lambda_{ik}^2$, is included in the prenet penalty. When ρ is large, we obtain a loading matrix that is similar to (6). Furthermore, as ρ

reduces, we obtain a loading matrix that is close to the true loading matrix in (5). Thus, the prenet penalty with $\gamma = 0.01$ satisfies both (i) and (ii).

4 Properties of the prenet penalty

4.1 Perfect simple structure

Most existing penalties, such as the lasso, shrink all coefficients toward zero when the tuning parameter ρ is sufficiently large; we usually obtain $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}} = \mathbf{0}$ when $\rho \to \infty$. However, the following proposition shows that the prenet penalty does not shrink some of the elements toward zero even when ρ is sufficiently large.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume that we use the prenet penalty with $\gamma \in (0, 1]$. As $\rho \to \infty$, the estimated loading matrix possesses the perfect simple structure, that is, each row has at most one nonzero element.*

Proof. As $\rho \to \infty$, $P(\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}})$ must satisfy $P(\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}) \to 0$. Otherwise, the second term of (1) diverges. $P(\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}) = 0$ implies $\hat{\lambda}_{ij}\hat{\lambda}_{ik} = 0$ for any $j \neq k$. Therefore, the ith row of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ has at most one nonzero element. □

The perfect simple structure is known as a desirable property in the literature on factor analysis, because it is very easy to interpret the estimated loading matrix (e.g., Bernaards and Jennrich 2003). When ρ reduces, the estimated loading matrix can be far from the perfect simple structure but the goodness of fit to the model is improved.

4.1.1 Relationship with k-means variables clustering

The perfect simple structure corresponds to variables clustering, that is, variables that correspond to nonzero elements of the jth column of the loading matrix belong to the jth cluster. One of the most popular cluster analyses is the k-means. In this Subsection, we investigate the relationship between the prenet solution with $\rho \to \infty$ and the k-means variables clustering.

Let $\boldsymbol{X}_N$ be an $N \times p$ data matrix. $\boldsymbol{X}_N$ can be expressed as $\boldsymbol{X}_N = (\boldsymbol{x}_1^*, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_p^*)$, where $\boldsymbol{x}_i^*$ is the ith column vector of $\boldsymbol{X}_N$. We consider the problem of the variables clustering of $\boldsymbol{x}_1^*, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_p^*$ by the k-means. Let C_j $(j = 1, \ldots, m)$ be a subset of indices of variables that belong to the jth cluster. The objective function of the k-means is

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{i \in C_j} \|\boldsymbol{x}_i^* - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{p} s_{ii} - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{1}{p_j} \sum_{i \in C_j} \sum_{i' \in C_j} s_{ii'}, \tag{7}$$

where $p_j = \#\{C_j\}$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j = \frac{1}{p_j}\sum_{i\in C_j}\boldsymbol{x}_i^*$, and recall that $s_{ii'}$ is expressed as $s_{ii'} = \boldsymbol{x}_i^{*T}\boldsymbol{x}_{i'}^*$. Let $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = (\lambda_{ij})$ be a $p \times m$ indicator variables matrix given by

$$\lambda_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1/\sqrt{p_j} & i \in C_j, \\ 0 & i \notin C_j. \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

Using the fact that $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \boldsymbol{I}_m$, the k-means variables clustering using (7) is equivalent to (Ding et al. 2005).

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} \|\boldsymbol{S} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\|^2, \quad \text{subject to (8).} \tag{9}$$

We consider slightly modifying the condition on $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ in (8) to

$$\lambda_{ij}\lambda_{ik} = 0 \ (j \neq k) \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \boldsymbol{I}_m. \tag{10}$$

The modified k-means problem is then given as

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} \|\boldsymbol{S} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\|^2 \text{ subject to (10).} \tag{11}$$

Note that condition (10) is milder than (8): if $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ satisfies (8), we obtain (10). The reverse does not hold; with (10), the nonzero elements for each column do not have to be equal. Therefore, the modified k-means in (11) may capture a more complex structure than the original k-means.

Proposition 4.2. *Assume that $\boldsymbol{\Psi} = \alpha\boldsymbol{I}$ and α is given. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ satisfies $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \boldsymbol{I}_m$. The prenet solution with $\rho \to \infty$ is then obtained by (11).*

Proof. The proof appears in Appendix A.1. □

The above proposition shows that the prenet solution with $\rho \to \infty$ is a generalization of the problem (11). As mentioned above, the problem (11) is a generalization of the k-means problem in (9). Therefore, the perfect simple structure estimation via the prenet is a generalization of the k-means variables clustering.

4.2 Relationship with quartimin criterion

As described in Section 3, the prenet penalty is a generalization of the quartimin criterion (Carroll 1953); setting $\gamma = 0$ to the prenet penalty in (3) leads to the quartimin criterion

$$P_{\text{qmin}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p}\sum_{j=1}^{m-1}\sum_{k>j}\lambda_{ij}^2\lambda_{ik}^2.$$

The quartimin rotation is realized with the use of the maximum likelihood estimate. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_{\text{ML}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}_{\text{ML}}$ be the maximum likelihood estimates of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$, respectively. Note

that the maximum likelihood estimate is not unique because of the rotational indeterminacy. The solution of the quartimin rotation is obtained by minimizing the quartimin criterion over all orthogonal rotations with the initial loading matrix being $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_{\mathrm{ML}}$, that is,

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} P_{\mathrm{qmin}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}), \text{ subject to } \boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_{\mathrm{ML}}\boldsymbol{T} \text{ and } \boldsymbol{T}^T\boldsymbol{T} = \boldsymbol{I}_m. \tag{12}$$

Assume that the maximum likelihood estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_{\mathrm{ML}}$ is unique if the indeterminacy of the rotation in $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_{\mathrm{ML}}$ is excluded[†]. The problem in (12) is then expressed as (Hirose and Yamamoto 2015)

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} P_{\mathrm{qmin}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}), \text{ subject to } \quad \ell(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}) = \hat{\ell}, \tag{13}$$

where $\hat{\ell} = \ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_{\mathrm{ML}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}_{\mathrm{ML}})$. As shown in the following proposition, the prenet solution is a generalization of the quartimin rotation.

Proposition 4.3. *Let* $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{qmin}} = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_{\mathrm{qmin}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}_{\mathrm{qmin}})$ *be the solution of (13). Assume that* $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{qmin}}$ *is unique. Let* ρ_t *(*$t = 1, 2, \dots$*) be a sequence that satisfies* $\rho_t > 0$ *and* $\lim_{t\to\infty} \rho_t = 0$*. Let the prenet solution with* $\gamma = 0$ *and* $\rho = \rho_t$ *be* $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\rho_t}$*. Then we obtain*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\rho_t} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{qmin}}.$$

Proof. The proof is given in Appendix A.2. □

Remark 4.1. With the penalization procedure, we can construct a penalty term that is based on other rotation criteria. For example, the penalty based on the varimax rotation (Kaiser 1958) may be expressed as

$$P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \sum_{j=1}^{m}\sum_{k\neq j}\sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_{ij}^2\lambda_{ik}^2 + \frac{1}{p}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p}\lambda_{ij}^2\right)^2.$$

The derivation is given in Appendix B. Although the varimax rotation is very popular, the corresponding penalty does not have the property that $\rho \to \infty$ leads to the perfect simple structure. In fact, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} = \mathbf{0}$ as $\rho \to \infty$. We derive several penalty terms based on the rotation criteria, but only the quartimin criterion possesses the perfect simple structure when $\rho \to \infty$.

Remark 4.2. In factor rotation, the normalized loading matrix

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{ij} = \frac{\lambda_{ij}}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{m}\lambda_{ik}^2}}$$

[†] Theorem 5.1 in Anderson and Rubin (1956) is an example of the condition for identification of factor loadings.

often provides better results than the unnormalized loading matrix. In the prenet penalization, we may use the normalized penalty, in which λ_{ij} is replaced with $\tilde{\lambda}_{ij}$

$$P(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \sum_{k>j} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(1-\gamma) \frac{\lambda_{ij}^2 \lambda_{ik}^2}{(\sum_{q=1}^{m} \lambda_{iq}^2)^2} + \gamma \frac{|\lambda_{ij}||\lambda_{ik}|}{\sum_{q=1}^{m} \lambda_{iq}^2} \right\}.$$

However, the above penalty is scale-invariant, that is, $P(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = P(a\mathbf{\Lambda})$ for any $a \in (0, 1]$. This fact is completely opposed to the basic concept of the penalization procedure that the penalty term should be small when the elements of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ are small. Instead, we may use a weighted penalty

$$P(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \sum_{k>j} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(1-\gamma) w_i^2 \lambda_{ij}^2 \lambda_{ik}^2 + \gamma w_i |\lambda_{ij}||\lambda_{ik}| \right\}, \tag{14}$$

where $w_i = 1/\sum_{q=1}^{m} \hat{\lambda}_{iq}^2$. Here, $\hat{\lambda}_{iq}$ is the (i, q)th element of the maximum likelihood estimate of loading matrix $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{\mathrm{ML}}$. Note that w_i is independent of the rotational indeterminacy. The weighted prenet penalty in (14) is a generalization of the quartimin criterion with the weighted loading matrix: with $\gamma = 0$ and $\rho \to 0$, we obtain a normalized loading matrix estimated by the quartimin criterion. This property can be proved in the same manner as Proposition 4.3.

5 Algorithm

It is well-known that the solutions estimated by the lasso-type penalization methods are not usually expressed in a closed form, because the penalty term includes an indifferentiable function. As the objective function of the prenet is nonconvex and nonseparable, it is not easy to construct an efficient algorithm to obtain a global minimum. Here, we use the GEM algorithm, in which the latent factors are considered to be missing values. The complete-data log-likelihood function is increased with the use of the coordinate descent algorithm (Friedman et al. 2010), which is a commonly used algorithm in the lasso-type penalization. Although our proposed algorithm is not guaranteed to attain the global minimum, our algorithm decreases the objective function at each step.

The prenet tends to be multimodal for large ρ, because our algorithm is a generalization of the k-means algorithm (the k-means algorithm also depends on the initial values). Therefore, we prepare many initial values, estimate the solutions for each initial value, and select a solution that minimizes the penalized loss function. In this case, it seems that we require heavy computational loads. However, as described in Subsection 5.2, we can construct an efficient algorithm for a sufficiently large ρ.

5.1 Update equation for fixed tuning parameters

We provide update equations of factor loadings and unique variances when ρ and γ are fixed. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\text{old}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\text{old}}$ are the current values of factor loadings and unique variances, respectively. The parameter can be updated by minimizing the negative expectation of the complete-data penalized log-likelihood function with respect to $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ (e.g., Hirose and Yamamoto 2015):

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \log \psi_i + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{s_{ii} - 2\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^T \boldsymbol{b}_i + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i}{\psi_i} + \rho P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) + \text{const.}, \tag{15}$$

where $\boldsymbol{b}_i = \boldsymbol{M}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\text{old}}^T \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\text{old}}^{-1} \boldsymbol{s}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{A} = \boldsymbol{M}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{M}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\text{old}}^T \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\text{old}}^{-1} \boldsymbol{S} \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\text{old}}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\text{old}} \boldsymbol{M}^{-1}$. Here, $\boldsymbol{M} = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\text{old}}^T \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\text{old}}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\text{old}} + \boldsymbol{I}_m$, and $\boldsymbol{s}_i$ is the ith column vector of $\boldsymbol{S}$. In practice, minimization of (15) is difficult, because the prenet penalty consists of nonconvex and nonseparable functions. Therefore, we use a coordinate descent algorithm and obtain updated parameters, say $(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\text{new}}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}^{\text{new}})$, which decrease the negative penalized complete-data log-likelihood function

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\text{new}}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}^{\text{new}}) \leq Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}).$$

The update equation of the coordinate descent algorithm is given in Appendix C.

After updating $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ using the coordinate descent algorithm, the unique variances of $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ are updated by minimizing the function (15)

$$\psi_i^{\text{new}} = s_{ii} - 2(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{\text{new}})^T \boldsymbol{b}_i + (\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{\text{new}})^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{\text{new}} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, p,$$

where ψ_i^{new} is the ith diagonal element of $\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{\text{new}}$, and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^{\text{new}}$ is the ith row of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\text{new}}$.

5.2 Efficient algorithm for sufficiently large ρ

For sufficiently large ρ, the ith column of loading matrix $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ has at most one nonzero element, denoted by λ_{ij}. With the expectation–maximization (EM) algorithm, we can easily find the location of the nonzero parameter when the current value of the parameter is given. Assume that the (i, j)th element of the loading matrix is nonzero and the (i, k)th elements $(k \neq j)$ are zero. Because the penalty function attains zero for sufficiently large ρ, it is sufficient to minimize the following function:

$$f(\lambda_{ij}) = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i - 2\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^T \boldsymbol{b}_i = a_{jj} \lambda_{ij}^2 - 2\lambda_{ij} b_{ij} \tag{16}$$

The minimizer is easily obtained by

$$\hat{\lambda}_{ij} = b_{ij} / a_{jj}. \tag{17}$$

Substituting (17) into (16) gives us $f(\hat{\lambda}_{ij}) = -\frac{b_{ij}^2}{a_{jj}}$. Therefore, the index j that minimizes the function $f(\lambda_{ij})$ is given by

$$j = \text{argmax}_k \frac{b_{ik}^2}{a_{kk}},$$

and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i$ is updated as $\hat{\lambda}_{ij} = b_{ij}/a_{jj}$ and $\hat{\lambda}_{ik} = 0$ $(\forall k \neq j)$.

5.3 Selection of the maximum value of ρ

The value of $\rho_{\max}$, which is the minimum value of ρ that produces the perfect simple structure, is easily obtained using $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}$ given by (17). Assume that $\hat{\lambda}_{ij} \neq 0$ and $\hat{\lambda}_{ik} = 0$ $(k \neq j)$. Using the update equation of λ_{ik} in (C1) and the soft thresholding function in (Appendix C), we show that the regularization parameter ρ must satisfy the following inequality to ensure that λ_{ik} is estimated to be zero:

$$\left| \frac{b_{ik} - a_{kj}\hat{\lambda}_{ij}}{a_{kk} + \rho\psi_i(1-\gamma)\hat{\lambda}_{ij}^2} \right| \leq \frac{\psi_i}{a_{kk} + \rho\psi_i(1-\gamma)\hat{\lambda}_{ij}^2} \rho\gamma|\hat{\lambda}_{ij}|.$$

Thus, the value of $\rho_{\max}$ is given by

$$\rho_{\max} = \max_i \max_{k \in C_i} \frac{|b_{ik} - a_{kj}\hat{\lambda}_{ij}|}{\gamma\psi_i|\hat{\lambda}_{ij}|},$$

where $C_i = \{k | k \neq j, \hat{\lambda}_{ij} \neq 0\}$.

5.4 Estimation of the entire path of solutions

The entire path of solutions can be produced with the grid of increasing values $\{\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_K\}$. Here, ρ_K is given by (5.3), and $\rho_1 = \rho_K \Delta\sqrt{\gamma}$, where Δ is a small value such as 0.001. The term $\sqrt{\gamma}$ allows us to estimate a variety of models even if γ is small.

The entire solution path can be made using a decreasing sequence $\{\rho_K \ldots, \rho_1\}$, starting with ρ_K. Note that the proposed algorithm at ρ_K does not always converge to the global minimum, so that we prepare many initial values, estimate solutions for each initial value with the use of the efficient algorithm described in Subsection 5.2, and select a solution that minimizes the penalized log-likelihood function. We can use the warm start, which can provide the starting values of the parameters: the solution at ρ_{k-1} can be computed using the solution at ρ_k, which leads to improved and smoother objective value surfaces (Mazumder et al. 2011). The cold start may be used, but it requires heavy computational loads.

6 Numerical study

6.1 Monte Carlo simulations

In this simulation study, we use four simulation models. The first three models are as below.

Model (A):

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.95 & 0.9 & 0.85 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\ 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.8 & 0.75 & 0.7 \end{pmatrix}^T,$$

Model (B):

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0.8 & 0.7 & 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.2 \\ 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.9 & 0.8 & 0.7 \end{pmatrix}^T,$$

Model (C):

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.8 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{25} & \mathbf{0}_{25} & \mathbf{0}_{25} & \mathbf{0}_{25} \\ \mathbf{0}_{25} & 0.75 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{25} & \mathbf{0}_{25} & \mathbf{0}_{25} \\ \mathbf{0}_{25} & \mathbf{0}_{25} & 0.7 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{25} & \mathbf{0}_{25} \\ \mathbf{0}_{25} & \mathbf{0}_{25} & \mathbf{0}_{25} & 0.65 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{25} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{25}$ is a 25-dimensional vector with each element being 1, and $\mathbf{0}_{25}$ is a 25-dimensional zero vector. We also use Model (D), which is similar to Model (C) but replace 100 randomly chosen elements out of 300 zero elements of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ with $U(0.4, 0.6)$. If the communality of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is greater than 1, the corresponding row is scaled so that the communality becomes 0.95. Then, the unique variances are obtained by $\mathbf{\Psi} = \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{I} - \mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{\Lambda}^T)$.

In Models (A) and (C), the loading matrix possesses the perfect simple structure. Model (C) is a large model compared with Model (A). The loading matrix of Model (B) is not sparse but we can interpret that the first factor is related to the first three observed variables, and the second factor is related to the remaining three observed variables. As the loading matrix is the same as that given in Section 3.2, the prenet penalty is expected to outperform the lasso. Model (D) is as large as Model (C) but does not possess the perfect simple structure. We use Model (D) to explore the performance of the proposed procedure when the true loading matrix does not possess the perfect simple structure.

The model parameter is estimated by the prenet penalty using $\gamma = 1.0$ and $\gamma = 0.01$, and the minimax concave penalty (MC penalty; Zhang 2010)

$$\begin{aligned} \rho P(\mathbf{\Lambda}; \rho; \gamma) &= \sum_{i=1}^{p} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \rho \int_0^{|\lambda_{ij}|} \left(1 - \frac{x}{\rho\gamma}\right)_+ dx \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{p} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left\{ \rho \left(|\lambda_{ij}| - \frac{\lambda_{ij}^2}{2\rho\gamma} \right) I(|\lambda_{ij}| < \rho\gamma) + \frac{\rho^2\gamma}{2} I(|\lambda_{ij}| \geq \rho\gamma) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

Table 3: Mean squared errors, true positive rates, and false positive rates of estimated factor loadings for Model (A).

		$N = 50$			$N = 100$			$N = 500$		
		MSE	TPR	FPR	MSE	TPR	FPR	MSE	TPR	FPR
AIC	lasso	0.10	1.00	0.56	0.04	1.00	0.55	0.01	1.00	0.55
	MC	0.07	1.00	0.24	0.02	1.00	0.14	0.00	1.00	0.14
	prenet_1	0.05	1.00	0.14	0.02	1.00	0.12	0.00	1.00	0.12
	$\text{prenet}_{.01}$	0.04	1.00	0.06	0.02	1.00	0.06	0.00	1.00	0.06
BIC	lasso	0.11	1.00	0.47	0.06	1.00	0.38	0.01	1.00	0.36
	MC	0.07	1.00	0.17	0.02	1.00	0.07	0.00	1.00	0.00
	prenet_1	0.04	1.00	0.04	0.01	1.00	0.01	0.00	1.00	0.00
	$\text{prenet}_{.01}$	0.03	1.00	0.01	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
EBIC	lasso	0.59	0.84	0.21	0.11	1.00	0.22	0.03	1.00	0.22
	MC	0.32	0.92	0.11	0.04	1.00	0.06	0.01	1.00	0.00
	prenet_1	0.03	1.00	0.00	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
	$\text{prenet}_{.01}$	0.03	1.00	0.00	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00

with $\gamma = \infty$ and $\gamma = 3$. Note that $\gamma = \infty$ with the MC penalty is equivalent to the lasso. The regularization parameter is selected by the Akaike information criterion (AIC), Bayesian information crietrion (BIC), and extended BIC (EBIC; Chen and Chen 2008)

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{AIC} &= -2\ell(\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}, \hat{\mathbf{\Psi}}) + 2p_0, \\
\text{BIC} &= -2\ell(\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}, \hat{\mathbf{\Psi}}) + (\log N)p_0, \\
\text{EBIC} &= -2\ell(\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}, \hat{\mathbf{\Psi}}) + (\log N)p_0 + 2p_0\delta \log(pm),
\end{aligned}$$

where p_0 is the number of nonzero parameters, and $\delta \in [0, 1]$ is a hyper-parameter of the prior distribution of the EBIC. In this simulation, we select $\delta = 1$. For each model, $T = 100$ data sets are generated with $\boldsymbol{x} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{\Lambda}^T + \mathbf{\Psi})$. The number of observations is $N = 50, 100$, and 500. Tables 3–6 show the mean squared error defined by

$$\text{MSE} = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{s=1}^{T} \frac{\|\mathbf{\Lambda} - \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(s)}\|^2}{pm},$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}^{(s)}$ is the estimate of the loading matrix using the sth dataset. We also compare the true positive rate (TPR) and false positive rate (FPR) of the loading matrix over 100 simulations.

We obtain the following empirical observations for each simulation model:

Table 4: Mean squared errors, true positive rates, and false positive rates of estimated factor loadings for Model (B).

		$N = 50$			$N = 100$			$N = 500$		
		MSE	TPR	FPR	MSE	TPR	FPR	MSE	TPR	FPR
AIC	lasso	0.26	0.88	—	0.17	0.90	—	0.16	0.90	—
	MC	0.30	0.76	—	0.22	0.80	—	0.20	0.80	—
	prenet_1	0.27	0.77	—	0.16	0.88	—	0.16	0.90	—
	$\text{prenet}_{.01}$	0.23	0.82	—	0.05	0.98	—	0.01	1.00	—
BIC	lasso	0.27	0.83	—	0.16	0.88	—	0.15	0.89	—
	MC	0.30	0.70	—	0.24	0.72	—	0.20	0.77	—
	prenet_1	0.28	0.63	—	0.20	0.70	—	0.15	0.88	—
	$\text{prenet}_{.01}$	0.31	0.54	—	0.17	0.65	—	0.01	1.00	—
EBIC	lasso	0.35	0.78	—	0.18	0.85	—	0.15	0.88	—
	MC	0.30	0.67	—	0.24	0.70	—	0.20	0.77	—
	prenet_1	0.25	0.51	—	0.22	0.52	—	0.15	0.86	—
	$\text{prenet}_{.01}$	0.25	0.50	—	0.21	0.50	—	0.02	0.98	—

Model (A): In almost all cases, the prenet penalty outperforms the lasso and MC in terms of both MSE and TPR. For example, when $N = 50$, the lasso and MC perform poorly with the EBIC. With the lasso and MC, the EBIC selects too simple a model, and thus, the estimated model is often a one-factor model, which is completely different from the true loading matrix. For the prenet penalty, the EBIC may select simple models (like the lasso), but it performs very well. This is because the prenet penalty estimates a model that possesses the perfect simple structure for large ρ.

Model (B): The prenet with $\gamma = 0.01$ outperforms the other methods, as seen in Section 3.2. In particular, when $N = 500$, the prenet with $\gamma = 0.01$ performs very well irrespective of the model selection criteria.

Model (C): The result is similar to that of Model (A). With high-dimensional data, the MC tends to perform much better than the lasso. The performance of the prenet penalty is almost independent of γ.

Model (D): For Model (D), the prenet penalty performs worse than the lasso-type regularization, because the true loading matrix is far from the perfect simple structure. In particular, when $\gamma = 0.01$, the prenet performs poorly.

Table 5: Mean squared errors, true positive rates, and false positive rates of estimated factor loadings for Model (C).

		$N = 50$			$N = 100$			$N = 500$		
		MSE	TPR	FPR	MSE	TPR	FPR	MSE	TPR	FPR
AIC	lasso	0.14	1.00	0.85	0.07	1.00	0.85	0.02	1.00	0.85
	MC	0.06	1.00	0.43	0.02	1.00	0.21	0.00	1.00	0.08
	prenet_1	0.02	1.00	0.04	0.01	1.00	0.02	0.00	1.00	0.03
	$\text{prenet}_{.01}$	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
BIC	lasso	0.35	1.00	0.52	0.24	1.00	0.51	0.09	1.00	0.52
	MC	0.07	1.00	0.41	0.02	1.00	0.19	0.00	1.00	0.00
	prenet_1	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
	$\text{prenet}_{.01}$	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
EBIC	lasso	0.91	0.49	0.06	0.48	0.98	0.13	0.22	1.00	0.16
	MC	0.91	0.52	0.03	0.50	0.99	0.04	0.00	1.00	0.00
	prenet_1	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
	$\text{prenet}_{.01}$	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00

6.2 Analysis of handwritten digits data

We apply the prenet penalty to well-known handwritten digits data (Hastie et al. 2008). We select the number "0," consisting of 1194 observations with 256 pixels (variables). The variables that have extremely small variances are removed, resulting in 184 variables.

We conduct variables clustering using the prenet, as described in Subsection 4.1. To our knowledge, variables clustering of image data via factor analysis has not yet been attempted. The prenet is compared with the k-means variables clustering, which is a special case of the prenet, as shown in Section 4.1.1. The results for $m = 5$, 10, and 15 are depicted in Figure 2. Color is used to denote a cluster. When $m = 5$, we make an interesting empirical observation. With the prenet, the same clusters show left–right symmetry, which means that we tend to write "0" with left–right symmetry. As the same clusters could be located in separate places, the cluster structure indicates not only the location of the pixels but also the habits of the people who usually write the letters. On the other hand, for the k-means, the same clusters are located in a circle, and each cluster is characterized by the size of the circle. The k-means clustering tends to assign clusters by the location of the pixels rather than people's writing habits. Therefore, the prenet might be able to capture a more complex structure than the k-means. When the number of factors (clusters) is large, the prenet and k-means produce similar results.

We also compare the reconstruction error. For k-means clustering, the data reconstruc-

Table 6: Mean squared errors, true positive rates, and false positive rates of estimated factor loadings for Model (D).

		$N = 50$			$N = 100$			$N = 500$		
		MSE	TPR	FPR	MSE	TPR	FPR	MSE	TPR	FPR
AIC	lasso	0.28	1.00	0.93	0.27	1.00	0.94	0.25	1.00	0.94
	MC	0.17	0.99	0.63	0.13	0.99	0.51	0.05	1.00	0.19
	prenet_1	0.27	1.00	0.92	0.24	1.00	0.92	0.43	1.00	0.92
	$\text{prenet}_{.01}$	0.66	1.00	0.99	0.61	1.00	0.99	0.50	1.00	1.00
BIC	lasso	0.32	0.99	0.91	0.29	1.00	0.91	0.25	1.00	0.91
	MC	0.19	0.99	0.62	0.11	0.99	0.48	0.05	1.00	0.15
	prenet_1	0.35	0.99	0.88	0.30	0.99	0.87	0.44	0.99	0.87
	$\text{prenet}_{.01}$	0.66	1.00	0.99	0.60	1.00	0.99	0.50	1.00	1.00
EBIC	lasso	0.84	0.97	0.63	0.54	0.99	0.75	0.24	1.00	0.83
	MC	0.22	0.99	0.61	0.12	0.99	0.47	0.03	1.00	0.13
	prenet_1	1.31	0.43	0.10	0.66	0.97	0.56	0.29	0.99	0.71
	$\text{prenet}_{.01}$	1.32	0.41	0.09	0.62	1.00	0.98	0.50	1.00	0.99



Figure 2: Results for FA (upper panels) and k-means (lower panels) when $m = 5$ (left panels), 10 (center panels), and 15 (right panels).

tion of $\boldsymbol{x}_n$ is achieved using $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\boldsymbol{\Lambda})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\boldsymbol{x}_n$, where $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ is the estimated loading matrix. In the prenet penalty, the data are reconstructed via the posterior mean:

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}E[\boldsymbol{F}_n|\boldsymbol{x}_n] = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{M}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}\boldsymbol{x}_n.$$



Figure 3: Reconstruction error when the number of factors (clusters) is 5 (left panel), 10 (center panel), and 15 (right panel). The x axis indicates the degrees of sparsity, and the y axis indicates the reconstruction errors.

We compress 359 test data with the above two methods and evaluate the performance by the reconstruction error. We also compare the performance of above-mentioned two methods with that of the lasso and MC penalties. The result is presented in Figure 3.

In the case of $m = 5$, the prenet penalty performs the best in terms of reconstruction error when the degree of sparsity is 0.2. The second best method is the k-means, which implies the prenet results in a better cluster structure than the k-means in terms of reconstruction error. The sparse estimations, such as the lasso and MC, perform very poorly. We observe that the lasso and MC result in a 3-factor model; the last two column vectors of the loading matrix result in $\mathbf{0}$. For small degrees of sparsity, it is better to use the prenet penalty. As the degrees of sparsity increase, the performance of the lasso and MC is competitive to that of the prenet.

When m is large, the performance of the prenet with the sparsest model (i.e., perfect simple structure) is slightly better than that of the k-means but almost equivalent. Interestingly, both lasso and MC perform poorly with small degrees of sparsity. As the degrees of sparsity increase, the performance of the lasso and MC improve considerably and then become equivalent to that of the prenet.

7 Discussion and conclusion

We proposed a prenet penalty, which is based on the product of a pair of parameters in each row of the loading matrix. The prenet penalty produced the perfect simple structure for large values of ρ, which gave us a new variables clustering method using factor models.

In real data analysis, we showed that the prenet was able to capture a complex latent structure and outperformed the k-means in terms of reconstruction error.

The proposed penalty is very general and can be applied to any low rank matrix factorization, such as principal component analysis (PCA), non-negative matrix factorization, and so on. In particular, the orthogonal nonnegative matrix factorization may be related to our method, because it corresponds to the perfect simple structure (Ding et al. 2005). The sparse PCA (Zou et al. 2006) also assumes the orthogonality of the loading matrix, but some rows become zero vectors with a large amount of penalty. It is interesting to apply the prenet penalty to other low rank matrix factorization methods, and compare the performance of the prenet with that of the existing estimation procedures.

The proposed method performed worse than sparse penalization, such as in the case of the MC penalty when the true loading matrix did not possess the perfect simple structure, as shown in Section 6.1. As described in Yamamoto and Jennrich (2013), the loading matrix does not always possess the perfect simple structure but it often has a well-clustered structure. In such a case, a different penalty must be used. In future research, it would be interesting to introduce a different penalty that captures a more complex cluster structure than the perfect simple structure.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Dr. Michio Yamamoto for his guidance and suggestions. This work was supported by a grant from Japan Society for the Promotion of Science KAKENHI 15K15949.

Appendix A Proofs

Appendix A.1 Proof of Proposition 4.2

Because of Proposition 4.1, with the prenet, $\hat{\lambda}_{ij}\hat{\lambda}_{ik} = 0$ as $\rho \to \infty$. Thus, the prenet solution satisfies (10) as $\rho \to \infty$. We only need to show that the minimization problem of loss function $\ell_{\mathrm{ML}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\Psi})$ is equivalent to that of $\|\boldsymbol{S} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\|^2$. The inverse covariance matrix of the observed variables is expressed as

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Lambda} + \boldsymbol{I})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}.$$

Because $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \boldsymbol{I}_m$, we obtain

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} = \alpha^{-1}\boldsymbol{I} - \frac{\alpha^{-2}}{\alpha^{-1}+1}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T.$$

The determinant of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ can be calculated as

$$|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}| = \alpha^{p-m}(1+\alpha)^m.$$

Then, the discrepancy function in (2) is expressed as

$$\frac{1}{2}\left\{\mathrm{tr}(\alpha^{-1}\boldsymbol{S}) - \frac{\alpha^{-2}}{\alpha^{-1}+1}\mathrm{tr}\left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\right) + p\log\alpha + m\log\left(1+\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) - \log|\boldsymbol{S}| - p\right\}.$$

Because α is given and $\|\boldsymbol{S} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\|^2 = -2\mathrm{tr}\left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\right) + \text{const.}$, we can derive (11).

Appendix A.2 Proof of Proposition 4.3

The proof follows Proposition 15.1 in Foucart and Rauhut (2013). When $\gamma = 0$, the prenet penalty coincides with the quartimin criterion. Then, we have

$$\ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\rho) + \rho P_{\mathrm{qmin}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_\rho) \leq \ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{qmin}}) + \rho P_{\mathrm{qmin}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_{\mathrm{qmin}}) \tag{A1}$$

for any $\rho > 0$. Since $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{qmin}}$ is the maximum likelihood estimate, we have

$$\ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\rho) \geq \ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{qmin}}). \tag{A2}$$

Then, we obtain

$$0 \leq \ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\rho) - \ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{qmin}}) \leq \rho P_{\mathrm{qmin}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_{\mathrm{qmin}}) - \rho P_{\mathrm{qmin}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_\rho),$$

and therefore,

$$P_{\mathrm{qmin}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_{\mathrm{qmin}}) \geq P_{\mathrm{qmin}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_\rho). \tag{A3}$$

Inequality (A1) implies that

$$\ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\rho) \leq \ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{qmin}}) + \rho P_{\mathrm{qmin}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_{\mathrm{qmin}}). \tag{A4}$$

Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' = \lim_{\rho\to 0}\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\rho$. From (A2) and (A4), we obtain $\ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}') = \ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{qmin}})$, which implies both $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}'$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{qmin}}$ are maximum likelihood estimates. Since $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{qmin}}$ is a solution of (13), it must be

$$P_{\mathrm{qmin}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_{\mathrm{qmin}}) \leq P_{\mathrm{qmin}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}'). \tag{A5}$$

(A3) and (A5) implies that

$$P_{\mathrm{qmin}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_{\mathrm{qmin}}) = P_{\mathrm{qmin}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}').$$

Since the solution of (13) is unique, we obtain $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_{\mathrm{qmin}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}'$.

Appendix B Construction of the varimax penalty

The varimax criterion (Kaiser 1958) is expressed by

$$Q(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \sum_{k=1}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\left\{\lambda_{ik}^2 - \frac{1}{p}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p}\lambda_{ik}^2\right)\right\}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{m}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{p}\lambda_{ik}^4 - \frac{1}{p}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p}\lambda_{ik}^2\right)^2\right\}.$$

However, we cannot directly apply the varimax rotation criterion $Q(\mathbf{\Lambda})$ as the penalty function $P(\mathbf{\Lambda})$, because the varimax criterion must be *maximized* under some constraint. In other words, if the varimax criterion is used as a penalty of the penalized factor analysis, it must be

$$\ell_\rho(\mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{\Psi}) = \ell(\mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{\Psi}) - \rho Q(\mathbf{\Lambda}). \tag{B1}$$

It is easily shown that $Q(a\mathbf{\Lambda}) > Q(\mathbf{\Lambda})$ for any $a > 1$. Thus, (B1) implies the estimate of factor loadings increase as ρ increases. Estimating coefficients that are too large are opposed to the basic concept of the penalization procedure; the penalization procedure usually shrinks some coefficients toward zero to produce stable estimates.

In order to overcome this problem, we consider the equivalent minimization problem of the varimax criterion.

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\lambda_{ik}^4 &= \sum_{k=1}^{m}\sum_{l=1}^{p}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\lambda_{ik}^2\lambda_{il}^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{m}\sum_{l\neq k}^{p}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\lambda_{ik}^2\lambda_{il}^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{p}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{m}\lambda_{ik}^2\right)\left(\sum_{l=1}^{p}\lambda_{il}^2\right) - \sum_{k=1}^{m}\sum_{l\neq k}^{p}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\lambda_{ik}^2\lambda_{il}^2\end{aligned}$$

Here, the value of $\sum_{k=1}^{m}\lambda_{ik}^2$ is invariant with respect to the orthogonal rotation. Therefore, maximization of (B1) over all loading matrices of the maximum likelihood estimate is equivalent to the minimization of the following function:

$$P(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \sum_{k=1}^{m}\sum_{l\neq k}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\lambda_{ik}^2\lambda_{il}^2 + \frac{1}{p}\sum_{k=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p}\lambda_{ik}^2\right)^2. \tag{B2}$$

We may use (B2) as a penalty function of the penalized factor analysis.

Appendix C Update equation via the coordinate descent algorithm

Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_i^{(j)}$ be a $(m-1)$-dimensional vector $(\tilde{\lambda}_{i1}, \tilde{\lambda}_{i2}, \ldots, \tilde{\lambda}_{i(j-1)}, \tilde{\lambda}_{i(j+1)}, \ldots, \tilde{\lambda}_{im})^T$. The parameter λ_{ij} can be updated by maximizing (15) with the other parameters $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_i^{(j)}$ and

with $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ being fixed, that is, we solve the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\lambda}_{ij} &= \arg\min_{\lambda_{ij}} \frac{1}{2\psi_i} \left\{ a_{jj}\lambda_{ij}^2 - 2\left(b_{ij} - \sum_{k\neq j} a_{kj}\tilde{\lambda}_{ik} \right) \lambda_{ij} \right\} \\
&\quad + \rho \left[\left\{ \frac{1}{2}(1-\gamma) \sum_{k\neq j} \tilde{\lambda}_{ik}^2 \right\} \lambda_{ij}^2 + \left(\gamma \sum_{k\neq j} |\tilde{\lambda}_{ik}| \right) |\lambda_{ij}| \right] \\
&= \arg\min_{\lambda_{ij}} \frac{1}{2\psi_i} \left\{ (a_{jj}+\beta)\lambda_{ij}^2 - 2\left(b_{ij} - \sum_{k\neq j} a_{kj}\tilde{\lambda}_{ik} \right) \lambda_{ij} \right\} + \rho\xi|\lambda_{ij}| \\
&= \arg\min_{\lambda_{ij}} \frac{1}{2} \left(\lambda_{ij} - \frac{b_{ij} - \sum_{k\neq j} a_{kj}\tilde{\lambda}_{ik}}{a_{jj}+\beta} \right)^2 + \frac{\psi_i\rho\xi}{a_{jj}+\beta}|\lambda_{ij}|. \qquad \text{(C1)}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta &= \rho\psi_i(1-\gamma) \sum_{k\neq j} \tilde{\lambda}_{ik}^2, \\
\xi &= \gamma \sum_{k\neq j} |\tilde{\lambda}_{ik}|.
\end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to minimizing the following penalized squared error loss function

$$S(\tilde{\theta}) = \arg\min_{\theta} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(\theta - \tilde{\theta})^2 + \rho^*|\theta| \right\}.$$

The solution $S(\tilde{\theta})$ can be expressed in a closed form using the following soft thresholding function.

$$S(\tilde{\theta}) = \text{sgn}(\tilde{\theta})(|\tilde{\theta}| - \rho^*)_+,$$

where $A_+ = \max(A, 0)$.

References

Adachi, K., and Trendafilov, N. (2015), "Sparse Orthogonal Factor Analysis," in *Advances in Latent Variables*, eds. M. Carpita, E. Brentari, and E. M. Qannari, Studies in Theoretical and Applied Statistics Springer International Publishing, pp. 227–239. Available at `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/10104_2014_2`

Anderson, T. W., and Rubin, H. (1956), Statistical inference in factor analysis,, in *Proceedings of the third Berkeley symposium on mathematical statistics and probability*, Vol. 5, p. 1.

Bernaards, C. A., and Jennrich, R. I. (2003), "Orthomax rotation and perfect simple structure," *Psychometrika*, 68(4), 585–588.

Carroll, J. B. (1953), "An analytical solution for approximating simple structure in factor analysis," *Psychometrika*, 18(1), 23–38.

Chen, J., and Chen, Z. (2008), "Extended Bayesian information criteria for model selection with large model spaces," *Biometrika*, 95(3), 759–771.

Choi, J., Zou, H., and Oehlert, G. (2011), "A Penalized Maximum Likelihood Approach to Sparse Factor Analysis," *Statistics and Its Interface*, 3(4), 429–436.

Ding, C. H., He, X., and Simon, H. D. (2005), On the Equivalence of Nonnegative Matrix Factorization and Spectral Clustering.,, in *SDM*, Vol. 5, SIAM, pp. 606–610.

Fan, J., and Li, R. (2001), "Variable Selection via Nonconcave Penalized Likelihood and its Oracle Properties," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96, 1348–1360.

Foucart, S., and Rauhut, H. (2013), *A mathematical introduction to compressive sensing* Springer.

Friedman, J., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2010), "Regularization Paths for Generalized Linear Models via Coordinate Descent," *Journal of Statistical Software*, 33.

Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., and Friedman, J. (2008), *The Elements of Statistical Learning*, 2nd edn, New York: Springer.

Hendrickson, A., and White, P. (1964), "Promax: A quick method for rotation to oblique simple structure," *British Journal of Statistical Psychology*, 17(1), 65–70.

Hirose, K., and Yamamoto, M. (2014), "Estimation of an oblique structure via penalized likelihood factor analysis," *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 79, 120–132.

Hirose, K., and Yamamoto, M. (2015), "Sparse estimation via nonconcave penalized likelihood in factor analysis model," *Statistics and Computing*, 25(5), 863–875.

Jennrich, R. (2004), "Rotation to simple loadings using component loss functions: The orthogonal case," *Psychometrika*, 69(2), 257–273.

Kaiser, H. (1958), "The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis," *Psychometrika*, 23(3), 187–200.

Lopes, H., and West, M. (2004), "Bayesian model assessment in factor analysis," *Statistica Sinica*, 14(1), 41–68.

Mazumder, R., Friedman, J., and Hastie, T. (2011), "SparseNet: Coordinate Descent with Nonconvex Penalties," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106, 1125–1138.

Ning, L., and Georgiou, T. T. (2011), Sparse factor analysis via likelihood and ℓ_1 regularization,, in *50th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference*, pp. 5188–5192.

Srivastava, S., Engelhardt, B. E., and Dunson, D. B. (2014), "Expandable Factor Analysis," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.1158*, .

Stock, J. H., and Watson, M. W. (2002), "Forecasting using principal components from a large number of predictors," *Journal of the American statistical association*, 97(460), 1167–1179.

Tibshirani, R. (1996), "Regression Shrinkage and Selection via the Lasso," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Ser. B*, 58, 267–288.

Tibshirani, R., Saunders, M., Rosset, S., Zhu, J., and Knight, K. (2005), "Sparsity and smoothness via the fused lasso," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 67(1), 91–108.

Tipping, M. E., and Bishop, C. M. (1999), "Probabilistic principal component analysis," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 61(3), 611–622.

Yamamoto, M., and Jennrich, R. I. (2013), "A cluster-based factor rotation," *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 66(3), 488–502.

Zhang, C. (2010), "Nearly Unbiased Variable Selection Under Minimax Concave Penalty," *The Annals of Statistics*, 38, 894–942.

Zou, H., and Hastie, T. (2005), "Regularization and Variable Selection via the Elastic Net," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Ser. B*, 67, 301–320.

Zou, H., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2006), "Sparse principal component analysis," *Journal of computational and graphical statistics*, 15(2), 265–286.